UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,159	02/23/2004	Edward H. Chandler		8496
Edward H. Cha	7590 04/04/200°	EXAMINER		
453 Dolphin Street			MAI, TRI M	
Melbourne Beach, FL 32951			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3781	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/785,159	CHANDLER, EDWARD H.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tri M. Mai	3781				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If 'NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D. 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/785,159 Page 2

Art Unit: 3781

1. Claims 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

"the rim", "said sleeve" has no antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 8, "such as" renders the claim indefinite.

Regarding claim 6 and 8, the recitation "well known" renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear what comprises the structure following "well known".

2. Claim 1, 4, 5, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.Ć. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Shin (5816396). Shin teaches a device having a holding means and fastening means for fastening the holding means externally to the golf bag.

Regarding claim 5, note the bifurcated hook 32 in Fig. 1 having two legs and providing gripping force for attaching

- 3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Mejeur (5566870). Shin meets all claimed limitations except for the hook and loop fastener on the billet member and on the strap. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide hook and loop fasteners on the billet and on the strap as taught by Mejeur, see fig. 4, to provide added security.
- 4. Claims 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of either Rogers (6571947) or Sidor et al. (4194547). Shin does not mention the cover being resilient. Either Rogers or Sidor teaches that it is known in the art to provide a golf holding being made from resilient material (col. 3, ln. 29; abstract, ln. 1 respectively). It would

Application/Control Number: 10/785,159 Page 3

Art Unit: 3781

have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the tube of Shin from resilient material to provide an alternative material for the tube.

- 5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Aliano, Jr. (5472084) in view of Rhee (4509643). Aliano, Jr. teaches a bag and a removable device being the sleeve 54 in Fig. 3. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the device 54 of resilient material, note portion 1, as taught by Rhee to provide the desired material for the bag.
- 6. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Perdue et al. (4869369). Perdue teaches a removable device having a holding means and fastening means as claimed.

Regarding claim 2, note that each pocket 40 in Perdue is hollow opening ended as claimed.

7. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Perdue in view of Slankster (7059470) or Little (D352392). To the degree it is argued that that the sleeve in Perdue is not a sleeve as claimed. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a tubular sleeve as taught by either Slankster or Little to provide an alternative pocket.

Note that Perdue teaches an upper and lower tabs and slots at 30, 31.

8. Claim 1-2, 4, 7-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Slankster (7059470). Slankster teaches a holding device with fastening means as claimed.

Regarding claim 2, note the protruding tabs holding rings 66, and the slot where rings 66 is inserted. Note also the similar bottom structure in Fig. 2.

Application/Control Number: 10/785,159

Art Unit: 3781

Regarding claim 7, note that the hook at 25 or 70 can be attached to the rim of the bag as claimed, and note the belt on the bottom having portion 25A in Fig. 1.

- 9. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Slankster in view of Mejeur. To the degree it is argued that that Slankster does not teach a belt. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a belt as taught by Mejeur to mount the ring 25 properly.
- 10. Claims 1, and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Little (D352392) in view of Shin (5816396). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a belt as taught by Shin to secure the bottom of holster to the bag easily.
- 11. Claims 7, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Little as set forth above in paragraph 10, and further in view of either Rogers or Sidor. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the holster from resilient material as taught by either Rogers or Sidor to provide the desired material.
- 12. Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri M. Mai whose telephone number is (571)272-4541. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on (571)272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/785,159 Page 5

Art Unit: 3781

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tri M. Mai
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3781